



CITY OF CHARLESTON

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SMALL

PUBLIC COMMENT

JULY 27, 2023

A meeting of the Board of Architectural Review – Small (BAR-S) will be held on **Thursday, July 27, 2023 at 4:30 p.m.** in the **Public Meeting Room, First Floor, 2 George Street.**

The following written comments will be provided to the board members 24 hours in advance of the meeting. The comments will also be acknowledged into the record and summarized. The public is encouraged to attend the meeting in person to speak in order for comments to be fully heard.

Application information is available at www.charleston-sc.gov/bar. Please check the website on the meeting date to view any withdrawn or deferred agenda items.

PUBLIC MEETING ACCOMMODATIONS:

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, people who need alternative formats, ASL (American Sign Language) Interpretation, or other accommodation, should please contact Janet Schumacher at 843-577-1389 or schumacherj@charleston-sc.gov three business days prior to the meeting.

For additional information, please contact:

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, PRESERVATION & SUSTAINABILITY
2 George Street, Suite 3100, Charleston, SC 29401 | 843-724-3781

B. APPLICATIONS

1. 1068 Morrison Drive

TMS # 461-09-03-072 | BAR2023-001166

NS | East Side | c. pre 1971 | Historic Corridor District

Request complete demolition of existing structure.

Owner: 1068 Morrison Drive LLC

Applicant: Zach Carman, The Middleton Group

Site visit 7/27/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

No Comments Submitted

2. 122 Logan Street

TMS # 457-08-02-085, 457-08-02-079 | BAR2023-001180

Category 3 | Harleston Village | c. 1927 - 1969 | Old and Historic District

Request complete demolition of the single-story storage, garage, and outbuilding hallway extension structures, and the 1948 chapel.

Owner: Fielding Home for Funerals

Applicant: Kyra Brower, LS3P

Site visit 7/27/2023 at 9:00 a.m.

No Comments Submitted

3. 79 Hester Street

TMS # 463-07-02-048 | BAR2023-001154

Category 4 | Wagener Terrace | c. 1950 | Historic Materials Demolition Purview

Request partial demolition of the existing roof form of house.

Owner: Thomas Lauderdale

Applicant: Thomas Lauderdale

Previous site visit 6/22/2023 at 8:30 a.m.

No Comments Submitted

4. 24 State Street

TMS # 458-09-01-120 | BAR2023-001181

Category 3 | French Quarter | c. 1841 | Old and Historic District

Requesting planter and wrought iron fence at rear courtyard. Response to previous appeal of staff approval of wall permit.

Owner: Ruthann Granito

Applicant: Jon Pennington, Meadors Inc

8 Comments Submitted:

• **Peggy Malaspina, 20 State Street**

Submitted 07/21/23 1:33:04 PM

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board of Architectural Review. My name is Peggy Malaspina. I am a full-time resident of 20 State Street, just next to 22-24 State Street, case #4 on the agenda for July 27, 2023. I applaud the improvements to the barrier proposed to separate the shared gardens of 22-24 State Street. A fence feels far more in character for the property than a wall, and the iron and brick are materials that fit into the existing property. However, I am still bothered by the jarring intrusion of the placement of the fence at the entrance to this courtyard. I believe that a fence set back 20 to 30 feet, in front of the first tree and the existing moat, would be a better solution, a solution that would be consistent with the BAR's principles regarding historic properties as well as Ms. Granito's wish for privacy. A fence set at that point and stretching over to her house would 1) preserve the lovely view through the archway, unimpeded, and 2) provide her with a substantial private garden, enclosed at that point. Since there is no entry to her side of the garden from her residence, except through the archway, this solution is in no way inconvenient or unsafe for her grandchildren. As a long-time, full-time resident of the French Quarter, I take quite seriously the stewardship of our historic neighborhood, which is, I believe, an obligation by virtue of our residence. This shared garden has been in place for well over 100 years. Political campaigns have been launched in its courtyard. Decades of Thanksgiving dinners, hosted by previous owner Nina Liu, and documented by the New York Times, began in the garden. New neighbors, including Ms. Granito herself, were welcomed in this garden. I hope that the BAR will continue to press for a solution that preserves that history. I hope that Ms. Granito will step up to preserve its open view and feel a proud member of our community for doing so.

• **Stephanie Wilson Gentile, 54 Queen St, Charleston SC 29401**

Submitted 07/22/23 2:17:37 PM

I appreciate the changes Ms. Granito and her contractors have made to the proposed division of the common courtyard at 22-24 State St. The proposed fence provides a light and airy barrier between the two properties. However, a recommendation was also made to move the fence (and its gate) further back into the property, to allow an unrestricted view of the common courtyard from the street. It has been mentioned that

sight lines such as the one between 22 and 24 State St. are unique in Charleston and such an historic view should be preserved. Moving the fence and gate back would still allow for a private and secure garden area for Ms. Granito and her family. Thank you for your consideration.

- **Virginia Marshall, 25 State Street**

Submitted 07/24/23 6:57:15 PM

Dear board members, I would like to address the issue of the proposed fence to divide the garden located at 24 and 22 State St. I would first like to state that I was not contacted by the homeowner for my opinion on the gate, as were all my neighbors. It is my understanding that the architect and the company doing the work could not locate my name or address. I find this to be very dubious, considering the construction company did, in fact, recently spend over a year working on the interior & exterior of my building. I live directly across the street from the properties involved. I am saddened by the fact that anyone would choose to divide this lovely garden. The walkway in the garden has a flowing river like design that promotes the serenity of the surrounding vegetation. The placement of a fence as currently planned, will disrupt the flow and decrease the current tranquility. Charleston is a city of secret gardens. And this garden is a prime example. It is frequently photographed by tourist due to its relatively unique central corridor. The previous design of the brick wall was appalling to say the least. I have since been shown plans by the owner of 22 State St. That include an iron fence. I feel this is a much more desirable option. If that is indeed, the route that has to be taken. I would like to go on record that the magnolia tree in the rear of the garden is not in fact on the property of 24 State as shown on their diagrams. A large portion of the base is on the 22 State St. side. I don't think it is unreasonable to request. Permanent surveyor marks be placed in the ground so as to prevent any further confusion as to where the property line is. Respectfully, Virginia Marshall 25 State Street

- **James Bruorton, 40 Calhoun Street, Suite 450**

Submitted 07/25/23 2:02:23 PM

I represent the interest of Tim and Rachel Brennan who own 26 State St. The most recent design documents prepared by Meadors (dated June 6, 2023) for this Project now call for work to be done on the historic brick wall separating 24 and 26 State St. The prior submission to BAR, which was approved, only sought approval of a new wall to be constructed between 22 and 24 State St. During that submission and approval process, no work was required under the Project documents on the historic brick wall separating 24 and 26 State St. Now, the drawings call for work on this fence described as "repoint brick on wall". The drawing is not specific as to how much area will be worked on nor have details been provided as to what "repoint brick on wall" means. Further, it is unclear whether the wall is actually on the 24 State St property. My clients believe at least a portion of the historic brick wall is located on 26 State St. (the "Brennan Property"). To date, the Brennans have had no communication with a representative from Meadors directly or the Owner of 24 State St. as to the recommended work on the historic brick wall separating 24 State St. from the Brennan Property. No information has been submitted by Meadors explaining what action will be taken to preserve the structural integrity of the wall during the repoint process. As legal counsel to the Brennans, I did obtain limited information that the proposed work is being done only on the 24 State St. side of wall and is aesthetic in nature. Unfortunately, the Meadors representative over the project, Jeremy Tate, is out of the office through July 26th and was unavailable. Another representative of Meadors provided the information referenced. Questions remain as to how the work will impact

the 26 State St. side of the property and what, if any, analysis has been performed to determine whether the proposed repointing of brick on the wall will negatively impact the structural integrity or the historic appearance of the wall. Public comment on April 27, 2023 brought forth questions related to Meadors use of an old survey done in 1970 and criticism of the size, aesthetic look, and location of the fence. None of the comments addressed work being done to the historic brick separation wall between 24 and 26 State St. because the plans under consideration at that time contained no such work. In June the plans were revised and now work is proposed to be done to the historic brick wall between 24 and 26 State St. without BAR approval. This agenda item is not a review of these plan revisions, but only addresses the request for planter and wrought iron fence at the rear courtyard and for response to the previous appeal of staff approval of wall permit (wall between 22 and 24 State St.). Nothing has ever been submitted to BAR or approved by BAR related to work done on the historic brick wall between 24 and 26 State St. On behalf of the Brennans, I am requesting that this item be deferred, and the Owner be required to present the updated June 2023 drawings to the BAR for public comment and BAR review. Until such time, no action should be considered or taken with regards to the referenced Project. Sincerely, James A. Bruorton IV Rosen Hagood, LLC

- **Derrick Niederman, 20 State Street**

Submitted 07/26/23 11:47:30 AM

I appreciated the opportunity to have a Zoom meeting with Jon Pennington, at which time Peggy Malaspina and I were able to see a rendition of the revised plan. I'd like to make two brief points. First, although the back part of the fence may well end up blending in with its surroundings, the same cannot be said for the initial segment of the fence, by which I mean the section that divides the open area in front: I was troubled to see such a lovely space fitted with the trappings of a prison. I realize that the contractors were doing the best they could with their chosen materials, but the human element is sorely missing. If I were visiting the property for the first time, my reaction would be along the lines of "Really?" The other point I'd like to make has an ironic touch. At the prior meeting this spring, the word "safety" came up time and again. I have to say that its prominence felt odd to anyone who has been in that courtyard, as there is nothing at all dangerous about it. The reference was apparently to possible future visits by young children, but the irony is that, within the proposed reconfiguration, the only feature to pose any conceivable danger to young, frolicking children would be the fence itself. Both of these issues could be resolved by restricting any fence to the rear half of the property, retaining the open space in front and still enabling the applicant to create a nice, private space in back.

- **Cynthia Seabrook**

Submitted 07/24/23 6:33 PM

See attached letter.

- **Esther Lapin**

Submitted 07/24/23 3:44 PM

See attached letter.

- **Janet Hopkins**

Submitted 07/24/23 2:00 PM

See attached letter.

5. 5 Glebe Street

TMS # 457-04-01-028 | BAR2021-000424

Category 2 | Harleston Village | c. 1847-48 | Old and Historic District

Requesting after the fact approval for alteration to front stair and handrails, side steps, alterations to front door.

Owner: Mt Zion AME Church

Applicant: Derek Mulkey, Distinctive Stone

1 Comment Submitted:

• **Kalen McNabb, 2811 Azalea Drive**

Submitted 07/25/23 4:02:23 PM

The report cover submitted in the agenda with my name describes the condition of the brownstone steps observed in July 2021. The lower stone treads were intact and covered with a thin cement wash and several generations of paint. The top tread appeared to be completely encased in a thick Portland cement render. The full report can be found in the BAR archives. I (Kalen McNabb) have not been involved with the project since the initial 2021 assessment.

6. 171 Church Street

TMS # 458-05-03-135 | BAR2023-001182

NC | c. 1909 | Old and Historic District

Requesting appeal of staff decision, building coating.

Owner: The Franke Building HPH

Applicant: Richard DiTullio

No Comments Submitted

7. 54 Church Street

TMS # 458-13-01-093 | BAR2023-001174

Category 4 | Charlestowne | c. 1880 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval for fenestration alterations and stucco changes.

Owner: Benjamin Mack

Applicant: Alexandra Little, Cozy Development

No Comments Submitted

8. 80 Alexander Street

TMS # 459-13-04-045 | BAR2023-001106

Category 2 | Mazyck - Wraggborough | c. 1850 | Old and Historic District

Requesting conceptual approval to reconstruct front steps, construct brick wall, alterations to crawlspace door, and hardscape alterations.

Owner: 80 Alexander LLC

Applicant: John Johansen

No Comments Submitted

9. 155 King Street

TMS # 457-08-04-039 | BAR2023-001139

NR | Harleston Village | c. pre-1888 | Old and Historic District

Requesting preliminary approval for façade renovations and new rear addition.

Owner: King George Realty LLC

Applicant: Simons Young

No Comments Submitted

Other Comments Submitted

- **James Schwab, 50 South Battery St**

Submitted 07/24/23 6:11:33 PM

When are going to just say "NO" to developers. Before spending time and money on plans, they must understand we are not for sale. The plan for 155 King is already too massive. An eighth story is unacceptable. Just say "NO"

- **Carolyn Holscher, 65 Anson St**

Submitted 07/25/23 2:02:53 PM

I live on Anson St. I'm a docent at the Gibbes, so I walk past the site frequently. An 8 story monolith from meeting to king st. This is totally inappropriate. This would be a massive complex. There is nothing even nearby that is anywhere near this scale. So wrong for Charleston.

From: Cynthia Seabrook <cseabrookchas1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 6:33 PM
To: bar@charleston-sc.org
Subject: Case #4 on the Agenda for July 27, 2023

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board of Architectural Review

My name is Cynthia Seabrook. I grew up in Charleston so the preservation of the City's history has, always, been very important to me.

I have spent many wonderful occasions in the courtyard/garden of 22 and 24

State Street over the years. Gladys Cote and Nina Liu have always been good friends of mine.

The courtyard/garden is such a special place with a long history. I believe that a fence is a much more harmonious divider, in the shared garden. The composition of iron and brick supports the surrounding architecture.

I feel that the beautiful view from the archway, into the courtyard and garden, should be preserved, if possible, by placing the fence further into the property.

I urge the BAR to find a solution in which this courtyard and garden's history and beauty will be preserved.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Mag Rab <magrab311@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 3:44 PM
To: bar
Subject: Fwd: BAR meeting of 7/27/23 - Agenda Item 4

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Charleston. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I plan to attend the meeting scheduled for Thursday, July 27th at 4:30 at 2 George Street. If the BAR wants me to read my email into the minutes for the meeting, I will do so.

Thank you.

Esther Lapin

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mag Rab <magrab311@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Jul 23, 2023 at 3:15 PM
Subject: BAR meeting of 7/27/23 - Agenda Item 4
To: <bar@charleston-sc.gov>

To Whom It May Concern:

I write in support of the appeal of Doe Cote, owner of 22 State Street, regarding the barrier placement on the adjoining property at 24 State Street, currently titled in the name of 24 State Street LLC.

The proposed barrier would be visible from State Street and Unity Alley, taking away part of the charm of the properties. Since March 4, 1988, Doe Cote has enjoyed the serenity and beauty of the courtyard area with all her former neighbors, all of which appreciated the openness the courtyard provided. Since March 4, 1988, Doe Cote has made 22 State Street her permanent, legal residence.

24 State Street LLC is the owner of record of 24 State Street with a mailing address of 2614 Croydon Road, Charlotte, NC, and is listed on tax records as "not legal residence". The Applicant for the variance does not utilize the property at 24 State Street as her permanent, legal residence, but she requests the BAR to grant a variance from its well-intentioned and needed regulations to allow the installation of a fixed barrier between the two properties that would be visible from both State Street and Unity Alley. One rationale offered by the Applicant for the barrier is to provide additional safety for any visiting grandchildren. Have other residents with small children requested a similar variance for the same purpose? Grandchildren grow up, negating the need for the structure; but if the variance is granted, the structure would remain in place until such time as the owner of 24 State Street decided to remove it.

Please rule in favor of Doe Cotes, a permanent, legal resident of 22 State Street, the adjoining property that would be negatively impacted by the placement of the barrier.

Thank you for your consideration.

Esther Lapin

From: Janet Hopkins <ahopkins49@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 2:00 PM
To: bar
Subject: Proposed fence at 22-24 State St

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Charleston. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear members of the Board of Architectural Review:

I understand that the BAR is considering a new design for a proposed dividing fence in the courtyard at 22 and 24 State Street. I attended the last BAR meeting and spoke in opposition to the adding of a wall, because it is a small, shared courtyard, and it would serve no purpose. It seems that having this fence visible from the street and sidewalk would look very awkward. Perhaps moving it back and having more space in the front might make it look better.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully yours,

JANET HOPKINS

French Quarter resident for 37 years
Sent from my iPhone